

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8-17, 20-29 and 32-42 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-5, 8-9, 13, 20-21, 25, 32-33, and 37-42 are amended, and claims 6-7, 18-19, and 30-31 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter disclosed therein.

The Office Action erroneously indicates that the rejection is a Final Rejection. However, per a telephone conference with Examiner Cao, and Examiner Cao's September 23, 2005 facsimile communication to Applicant's representative, the September 20, 2005 Rejection is corrected to be non-final.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 8-9, 13, 20-21, 25, 32-33, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over "Centipede" video game by Atari Corporation (Atari); and claims 1-42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nagle (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,096) in view of Moore et al. ("Collision Detection and Response for Computer Animation") and further in view of Atari. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

In particular, none of the applied references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest an image generation system and associated image generation method and computer useable program for generating an image of a three-dimensional object formed by a plurality of parts visible from a given viewpoint within a three-dimensional object space, that includes playing a motion of the three-dimensional object and generating the motion of the three-dimensional object as recited in independent claim 8 and similarly recited in independent claims 9, 20, 21, 32, 33 and 37-42.

Specifically, Nagle teaches a method of computer operation and a software system for operating a computer to generate realistic collisions between animated bodies (Abstract).

Moore teaches collision detection and response and describes modeling collisions of arbitrary bodies using springs (Abstract).

Moreover, Atari teaches a two-dimensional game, as indicated by Figs. 1 and 2 provided with the September 20, 2005 Office Action. Specifically, Fig. 2 of Atari clearly teaches a game taking place in a two-dimensional space, and as such, cannot disclose or suggest generating the motion of an object through a physical simulation. Such a physical simulation is only possible in a three-dimensional object space, not in a two-dimensional object space. For example, a generation of a motion of an object through physical simulation is illustrated in the drawings at, for example, Figs. 5A, 5B, 6A and 6B, where an enemy character or object 10 is shown going through a motion through a physical simulation. A comparison between Atari's Fig. 1 and the above-discussed drawings clearly show that Atari does not disclose or suggest generating the motion of an object through physical simulation because Atari does not have a three-dimensional object space and only has a two-dimensional object space. Thus, Atari fails to disclose or suggest an image generation system and associated computer useable program and image generation method that includes generating an image of a three-dimensional object formed by a plurality of parts visible from a given view point within a three-dimensional object space and generating the motion of the three-dimensional object through a physical simulation, as recited in the independent claims. Moreover, neither Nagle nor Moore, alone or in combination, cure deficiencies in Atari in disclosing or rendering obvious this feature. As such, independent claims 8-9, 20-21, 32-33 and 37-42, and their dependent claims, are patentable over a combination of Atari, Nagle and Moore.

Finally, none of the applied references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest switching processing from a generation of the object's motion through the physical simulation to a play of the object's motion based on the pre-stored motion data when a condition is satisfied, as recited in independent claims 8-9, 20-21, 32-33 and 37-42. The Office Action (page 15) asserts that Nagle teaches playing a motion of an object based on prestored motion

data and points to col. 3, line 50 - col. 4, line 23. However, the relevant portion of Nagle teaches "extensive supervision or intervention by the human animator" where a user stores in memory a large number of locations of a body as it falls down a flight of stairs (col. 3, lines 48-55), and then replays the various frames in order to mimick a body falling down a flight of stairs to "appear realistic." (Col. 4, lines 1-4). Thus, Nagle does not teach switching processing from a play of the object's motion based on the prestored motion data to a generation of the object's motion through a physical simulation, as recited in the independent claims.

For at least these reasons, none of the applied references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of independent claims 8-9, 20-21, 32-33 and 37-42. Thus, these independent claims, and their dependent claims, are patentable over a combination of the applied references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-5, 8-17, 20-29 and 32-42 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Tarik M. Nabi
Registration No. 55,478

JAO:TMN/amw

Date: February 21, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--